DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 118 033 HE 007 067

AUTHOR Flanagan, Dan
TITLE The Impact of American Higher Education on Undergraduate Student Valuing.
PUB DATE Aug 75
NOTE 38p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Development; Concept Formation; *Higher Education; Literature Reviews; Peer Relationship; Personal Values; *Research Methodology; Student Attitudes; *Student College Relationship; Student Teacher Relationship; *Undergraduate Students; *Values

ABSTRACT

American higher education is a socializing institution and therefore allegedly influences the values of its participants. Colleges and universities are complex organizations that claim to transfer knowledge and skills to students. In order to communicate knowledge and skills, colleges and universities have developed highly organized disciplines. In the process of categorization and transmitting knowledge and skills, implicit and explicit values are also communicated to students. Along with these formal influences on student values, there are a variety of informal influences on students. The informal influences include personal contact with faculty and student peers. Research into the impact of American higher education on undergraduate student valuing has proven to be as complex as the internal organization of colleges and universities, which provide a variety of potential influences on the formation of student values. Researchers have obtained data that are conflicting and often unreliable. Research methods have been questionable. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED118033

The Impact of American Higher Education on Undergraduate Student Valuing

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

by

Dan Flanagan

The University of Massachusetts

August, 1975

Box 386

North Amherst, Massachusetts 01059

HE007067

The Impact of College on Student Values

Abstract

The literature relating to the impact of higher education on student values is reviewed and analyzed. The review focuses on three major periods of research: (1) following Philip Jacob's Changing Values in College (1957); (2) Feldman and Newcomb's 1968 publication of The Impact of College on Students; and (3) the research which followed the Feldman and Newcomb publication. It is concluded that different research methods, an approach more adequately reflecting the complex influences on student values, and a clearer definition of value and its relationship to other concepts of the belief system ARE needed.

The Impact of American Higher Education on Undergraduate Student Valuing

American higher education is a socializing institution (Parsons and Platt, 1973), and therefore, allegedly influences the values of its participants. Colleges and universities are complex organizations that claim to transfer knowledge and skills to students. In order to communicate knowledge and skills, colleges and universities have developed highly organized disciplines. For example, schools and departments exemplify general categories of knowledge and skills. More specific categorization occurs on the level of individual programs. In the process of categorizing and transmitting knowledge and skills, implicit and explicit statements of value are also communicated to students. Along with these formal influences on student values, there are a variety of informal influences on students. The informal influences include personal contact with faculty and student peers, the personal influences.

Research into the impact of American higher education on undergraduate student valuing has proven to be as complex as the internal organization of colleges and universities which provide a variety of potential influences on the formation of student values. Researchers have obtained data which are conflicting and often unreliable. Research methods have often been questionable. In short, researchers have been unable to identify with any consistency

significant influences on student valuing.

The purpose of this paper will be to place the problem of identifying the impact of college on student values in perspective by reviewing the literature and suggesting alternative approaches for further research. The review of literature will concentrate on three historical periods:

(1) the conclusions of Philip Jacob and his major respondent Allen Barton;

(2) the major contributions of Feldman and Newcomb; and

(3) the major trends in research since Feldman and Newcomb published The Impact of College on Students.

This general review will be concluded by a discussion of the methods and instruments used by researchers to measure changes in student values and the limitations of these methods.

The amount of literature available relating to the values of college students is staggering, but this study will concern itself only with literature which relates to how student values are affected by higher education. We will examine the debate between those who suggest college affects changes in student values and those who suggest college has no significant affect on student values. Among those who conclude that college does affect changes in the values of students, we will examine why and how their research suggests the changes occur.

A variety of methods have been used to measure potential changes in student values. Most researchers use either the cross-sectional or longitudinal study method. The cross-sectional method looks at "characteristics of students at different class levels... at the same point in time.... If class levels differ in average score, change is inferred. In the second design, labeled longitudinal, the same students (known as a panel) are measured on the same instrument, at different points in time (Feldman and Newcomb, 1968, p.6)." The research reported in the review of literature is generally of the longitudinal design.

A problem of definition arises in most of the research on student values. The literature often uses terms which may be related to the concept of value without distinguishing the terms from values. For example, there occurs a frequent confusion between values and attitudes. This general lack of conceptual clarity offers a significant handicap which will be considered when analyzing the literature.

A General Review of the Literature

Philip Jacob

Although highly criticized, Philip Jacob has provided much of the stimulus for the research on the impact of higher education on student values. Jacob's Changing Values in College (1957) was concerned with the more formal aspects of the college environment such as

the teaching-learning process. His general conclusion was that the college years brought little if any significant change in the values of students which could be attributable to the impact of higher education. The changes he found were attributed to the continuing socialization process of life, or changes toward greater conformity.

> The main overall effect of higher education upon student values is to bring about general acceptance of a body of standards and attitudes characteristic of college-bred men and women in the American community (Jacob, 1957, p. 4).

Jacob was emphatic that student values were not significantly influenced by the curriculum, faculty or by instructional methods. "The impetus to change does not come primarily from the formal educational process (Jacob, 1957, p. 4)." Jacob concluded that the only significant impact for change could be found in colleges fostering strong value-commitments: the distinctive environment encouraged by a few private institutions, commited faculty, and value-laden personal experiences integrated with a student's cognitive development (Jacob, 1957, p. 11). Although the teaching-learning process, in general, did not have a significant impact on student values, the more informal philosophical and social influences might have a significant impact. It is this potential influence that Jacob concludes may hold possibilities for higher education to have a

greater impact on student values.

Studying the Effects of College Education (1959) was Allen Barton's attempt to critically analyze the conclusions of Jacob. Barton's main concern was with what he considered Jacob's failure to define the problem. Barton claimed that Jacob's approach was entirely too general, failed to define the kind of impacts to be analyzed, did not obtain valid measures and that Jacob did not apply his measures to a proper design (Barton, 1959, pp 75). Barton suggested that such studies of the impact of college on student values ought to consider the possible influences of the total college environment, including the formal teaching-learning process and the more informal aspects of college life. Barton also suggested that influences external to the college environment could be isolated to help understand the specific impact of higher education on student values. Barton rejected Jacob's conclusion that the college experience had little or no effect on students. Barton suggested that colleges do have a positive influence on students when research methods consider the total environment of the student.

Feldman and Newcomb

The Feldman and Newcomb study published as The Impact of College on Students (1968) was an extensive review of the literature since the 1930's. Feldman and Newcomb were seeking an answer to the question,

"under what conditions have what kinds of students changed in what specific ways (1968, pp 3-4)?"

One of the threads of research discussed by Feldman and Newcomb was the research of Jacob, Whitely (1938) and Duffy (1940). Each found student values relatively constant throughout the college experience. Duffy, using the Allport, Vernon Study of Values (1931), did find a "trend toward increased theoretic and aesthetic values scores, and possibly toward increased social values scores....".

Most of the research reported by Feldman and Newcomb did suggest changes in student valuing patterns during college, and some of the changes were signifcant. Although research methods began to find specific areas of change in student valuing, researchers were cautious not to equate any student changes in valuing with the student's experience in higher education (Dressel and Lehmann, 1965, pp 250). Research had been unable to isolate the effects of higher education on student values from other potential influences, i.e. the family, work, and religion.

Most research cited in the Feldman and Newcomb publication began to use control groups, focusing on the differences between students and non-student populations. One approach was that of Irving J. Lehmann (1963) who concluded that there were significant differences in the changes in student valuing as compared with those

changes found in non-student groups. Lehmann concentrated not on the changed patterns of student valuing, but on what particular influences might have caused the changes. "Changes in personality characteristics may be a function of the person's maturity or personality, a function of the times we live in, the direct result of college experiences, or a combination of one or more such factors (Lehmann, 1965, pp 69)." Trying to identify the effect of those specific influences on the student valuing process was no easy task.

Feldman and Newcomb report on a number of research studies which might support Jacob's conclusion that environments with strong value-commitments are more likely to significantly influence student values. Hunter (1942), for example, tested women in a small, southern liberal arts college and found significant value changes. Newcomb's own Bennington College study (1943) offers another example. Both studies indicated significant changes in values during the college experience, but changes occured in the direction of the value commitment of the institutions. Hence, Jacob claimed the college experience was socializing rather than liberalizing.

Lehmann and Ikenberry (1959) found no difference in the value orientations of students completing one year of college and those students who dropped out.[1] K. Patricia Cross began with ten thousand students as high school graduates and found two significant items:

there was a significant change in authoritarianism of the college students, but almost no change in authoritarianism for those persons who did not attend college; and student characteristics prior to college may be an indicator of their perserverance in higher education and their likelihood of changing (Cross, 1968, pp 3).

> In a nutshell, they found that young peoples' values and attitudes do change--that, generally speaking, college students become more critical in their thinking, more tolerant, flexible, and autonomous in attitude, and less prejudiced in their judgments. There is evidence that young people who embark upon jobs or full-time homemaking do not show this same kind of development.

These examples indicate inconsistent research findings.

Alexander Astin (1971) found a pronounced shift in student attitudes to a more liberal direction. The shifts Astin identified appear to be toward such attitudes as freedom and power (1971, pp 9).

Probably the major study on student valuing in the early 1960's was the Michigan State University study of Lehmann and Dressel (1963). Their longitudinal study over the years of 1958 to 1962 included several significant

findings. Contrary to the 1959 findings of Lehmann and Ikenberry, this 1963 report indicates that the amount of time spent in college might affect changes in student values. The study included tests of a group of males who dropped out of college in their freshman year and a group of males who completed four years of college. "The significance between the groups stemmed not so much from the magnitude of change by each group, but from the fact that they moved in opposite directions in their value orientations (Lehmann and Dressel, 1963, pp 42)." The four year group became more liberal, and the other group more conservative in their value orientations. This type of divergent change was elaborated in the report of Lehmann, Sinha and Hartnett (1966, pp 92). The 1963 study of Lehmann and Dressel suggests, though, that college attendance cannot conclusively be said to be a signifcant factor in creating more liberal values. They conclude that a college education cannot always be used as the only criterion to predict the degree and direction of change in traditional value orientations. Instead, Lehmann and Dressel suggest that higher education may facilitate development which may be a natural process in human beings (1963, pp 165).

> College students <u>do</u> change during the period of college attendance and, generally speaking, the amount and nature of change are related to the period of time spent at

> college. However, individual students and identifable subgroups change in varying degrees and even in different directions (Lehmann and Dressel, 1963, pp 256).

Lehmann and Dressel were suggesting that the characteristics of students upon entering higher education may be strongly influential in determining how and to what extent student values change. Feldman and Newcomb (1968) develop a theory of accentuation from similar data.

The concept of higher education as a catalyst to changes that would ordinarily occur as the individual matures gained considerable acceptance (Lehmann, et al, 1966; Lehmann and Dressel, 1963). To Lehmann and Dressel, this catalytic function of higher education for student valuing was not to be considered an insignificant impact on students.

Lehmann and Dressel (1963) also suggested that the major changes in student values came in the freshman and/or sophomore years. Their conclusion was not commonly shared among researchers. For example, after reviewing the available research, Feldman and Newcomb (1968, pp 101) were not convinced that changes in student values could be said to be greater at any particular point during the college career. Even Lehmann's report with Ikenberry (1959) did not draw such a conclusion indicating that he had changed his opinion. His conclusion that changes in student values can be largely attributed to the first

two years of college appear to be influenced by the Michigan State study.

The basis of the Feldman and Newcomb theory of accentuation lies in the tendency of students to seek other individuals, groups and experiences that the student perceives to hold similar value orientations as him/herself. Assuming this theory of association to be true, the ultimate outcome in terms of change in student values will largely be in directions congruent with the shared values of the person or group as a whole (Feldman and Newcomb, 1968, pp 333). The group may refer to student peers, faculty, or other persons. "Students, like other people, tend to meet or to seek out and associate with others who have similar attitudes and values. Insofar as this occurs, processes of consolidation are ubiquitous; we suspect that they are at once the most common and the least noticed sources of colleges' impacts on their students (1968, pp 330)." Feldman and Newcomb's identification and expansion of the "maintenance of existing values" theory is an important contribution to the study of student valuing.

Among the particular values which Feldman and Newcomb identify as undergoing the most changes are religious and aesthetic values. "Without exception, aesthetic values are of higher relative importance to seniors than to freshmen, while with only one exception in thirteen comparisons, religious values are of lower

importance to seniors than to freshmen.... The relative importance of social values often increases slightly from freshmen to senior year... (Feldman and Newcomb, 1968, pp 8)."

Post Feldman and Newcomb

Since the publication of The Impact of College on Students (1968), there have been three basic thrusts in the research concerning the impact of higher education on student valuing. First is a more comprehensive approach to the valuing process in terms of studying and recognizing a greater variety of possible variables. Secondly, there seems to be more of an attempt to seek answers to underlying questions concerned with student valuing. Why, and how do values change and are the changes desirable? Finally, some researchers have now moved to clarify the definition of terms, particularly of the term value.

Only a few months following The Impact of College on Students, Axelrod and Freedman (1969) published their conclusion that "...the most important determinant of the outcome of college experience consists of the characteristics of the student when he enters college (1969, pp 154)." This conclusion focuses on the realization that considerable socialization occurs with individuals before they reach the level of higher education. Although related, it is a significantly different contribution than the Feldman and Newcomb theory of accentuation. Axelrod and Freedman refer more clearly to the student's personal history as a significant

factor in examining value change, whereas, Feldman and Newcomb emphasize the tendency of the college environment to encourage value formations consistent with the student's personal history. There seems to be a difference in emphasis.

A considerable number of researchers have focused on the complexities of the developmental process of a person. For example, a major study at Harvard University culminated in the publication by William G. Perry, Jr. of Forms of Intellecutual and Ethical Development in the College Years (1970). The pressing question emerging from the study was "What environmental sustenance most supports students in the choice to use their competence to orient themselves through Commitments....(1970, pp 213)?" Perry's concern was how a student developed a sense of responsibility during the college years. Perry's conclusion was that

> For the majority...the most important support seemed to derive from a special realization of community. This was the realization that in the very risks, separateness and individuality of working out their commitments, they were in the same boat not only with each other but with their instructors as well (1970, pp 213).

In terms of value changes, Perry seems to be suggesting the supportive nature of the college environment provides a significant clue to researchers. Conformity or risk taking behavior may be rewarded.

There have been several persons concerned about the problems presented to researchers in the variety of variables that interact in intricate ways to bring about changes in student valuing. Bennett (1970) and Elton (1969) are two examples. Bennett particularly was conscious of the complexity of the problem. Some of the variables he considered include personal history and significant student choices, the variety of characteristics of the institution, the external social environment, influence of the faculty, student peers, and curriculum. An interesting variable found by Pearson and Levin (1971, pp 850) was the focal point or major orientation of the student's life. In their research, they found a significant relationship between a student's use of a reference group with particular value orientations. For example, Pearson and Levin found that students using home-and-family as a reference group were more establishment-oriented than their counterparts using the immediate academic community as a reference point. This kind of contribution is helpful to educators when comparing the relative value changes of commuter and resident student (Flanagan, Note 1).

Some of the most signifcant contributions of the post Feldman and Newcomb era have come from Arthur Chickering's Education and Identity (1972). Chickering takes to task the kinds of changes in valuing that researchers have been seeking. He argues that changes

in the "content of Belief" are not as significant as other changes. For example, the content may change toward increased liberalism without an associated change in the salience of the values held (1972, pp 126). Secondly, Chickering warns that changes in student values need not be drastic (1972, pp 125-126). Change does not mean radical conversion of one's values.

The important point that Chickering contributes to the study of student value changes is that "there may be other changes of greater significance. The bases on which values rest, the ways in which they are held, and the force with which they operate in daily life, may be of more importance--within limits--than the particular values held (1972, pp 126-127)." Joseph Katz made a similar point less forcefully in 1968.

Some researchers have begun to question the appropriateness of some educational programming based on data provided by value research. For example, the study of John Sikula, Roberta Sikula and Andrew Sikula (1974) on black and white university interns in a teaching program appears to verify Jacob's claim that higher education tends to "mold" students into some preconceived model.

> This study demonstrates that values changes did take place during an experimental teacher preparation program, but are the changes which occurred desirable? Should such programs serve to make everyone more alike? Some broader questions come to mind.

> How can we build into our educational system ways to respect individual differences rather than to modify and mold them? Is it really possible or desirable to respect individual differences and values, behavior etc. in formalized school settings (Sikula, et al, 1974, pp 14)?

The final significant trend in research on student values in the post Feldman and Newcomb era has been associated with Milton Rokeach. Rokeach (1972, 1973) has attempted to clarify the definitions and distinctions between the terms researchers have been using in values research.

Rokeach's concept of a hierarchy of values in an organized system was a significant contribution to the study of the impact of higher education on student values. It was Rokeach who suggested that values may change in relative importance from one point in time to another. Change, then, can be defined as "a reordering of priorities... (1973, pp 11)," not a radical substitution of one value for another.

Rokeach also contributed to the identification and understanding of the concern for the enormous variety of influences on the life of a student (1973). He suggested that each institution in society concentrates on enhancing a particular subset of values.

> Further research is needed to identify more clearly the particular subset of values that each social institution focuses upon, the extent of overlap and competition among institutional values, the effectiveness of different social institutions and organizations as value-socializing agents, and the conditions under which institutional value change can be brought about (Rokeach, 1973, pp 327).

In summary, Philip Jacob appears to have been the catalyst for increasing interest in the question of the impact colleges have on student values. Changing Values in College (Jacob, 1957) motivated much of the research reported in The Impact of College on Students (Feldman and Newcomb, 1968).

Jacob concluded that college had little effect on student values. The effect he could find he defined as socialization. Jacob's conclusion stands in contrast to most research that followed. Feldman and Newcomb, for example, propose a theory of accentuation, i.e. the college experience tends to encourage change in values consistent with his/her personal history. A student's personal history, in some sense, determines the effect of the college experience on the student's values.

Since Feldman and Newcomb published The Impact of College on Students (1968) researchers have begun to search at least two questions in greater detail. What particular elements of the college environment affect student valuing more than others (Perry, 1970) and how are values held (Chickering, 1972) by students? The theory of accentuation continues to be the major accepted theory. A third trend, represented by Rokeach (1973), has been an attempt to define the concept of value and distinguish it from other concepts such as attitude.

Measurement of Value Changes in Students

Almost all of the research on the impact of higher education on student valuing has used an instrument to measure value change. There were several reasons for the extensive use of instruments as opposed to interviews. Instruments could be used to test larger numbers of people. Instruments were less time consuming. Finally, instruments provide at least some objective criteria and continuity for judging comparative value changes from one student group to another.

There are four general methods by which values can be measured (Lehmann, 1967, pp 47-42). Three of the methods involve personal judgments on the part of the researcher and the fourth involves the student's ability to report their own values.

(1) Students are presented a set of particular statements from which the researcher can infer values from the student's responses.

(2) The researcher can simply report on student behavior.

(3) The researcher may present the student with hypothetical situations from which value inferences can be made.

(4) The student could be asked about their personal perceptions of what they value.

There are at least a half dozen instruments that have been developed for measuring value change (see Robinson and Shaver, 1973). The two most popular instruments have been the Allport, Vernon, Lindzey Study of Values developed in 1931 and revised in 1951 and 1960, and the Rokeach Value Survey which was developed in 1968. Both instruments have been designed to test the relative importance of certain values. The Allport, Vernon, Lindzey Study of Values is based on six areas of inquiry taken from Spranger's Types of Men (1928).[2] The Study of Values (1960) reflects these six areas. The Rokeach Value Survey simply lists eighteen instrumental and eighteen terminal values for the student to rank in order of relative importance. Both are forced choice questionnaires.

Limitations of Past Studies

The most apparent problem with researching student values is the application of instruments to a highly conditional element such as the valuing process (Dukes, 1955, pp 26). Developing the appropriate questions to analyze the problem of value change is an extremely difficult process. Value formation is a dynamic process and an instrument can only indicate the student's valuing process at one particular point in time. Instruments are less reliable in indicating patterns of valuing.

Irvin J. Lehmann outlined the limitations of instrument studies in this way:

(1) Though the measurement of values is necessarily indirect, there are a few areas in which direct observation might be employed. Both overt and covert aspects of behavior could, in certain circumstances, be measured. However, value measures are more commonly instrospective in nature.

(2) The manner in which attitudes and values reflect themselves in behavior is governed in part by the nature of the momentary situation. Thus, the realiability of various items is often low.

(3) The required precision of measurement may vary, depending upon the effects to be studied.

(4) Our scales do not measure an individual's attitudes or values, per se, but are a

reflection of those values held by average people. Our instruments are scales and there is no scale which does not depend upon the central tendencies and dispersions of opinions expressed by many people.

(5) Inasmuch as values, within certain frames of reference, may be affective and perhaps a subconscious basis for action, what a subject reports may be only a rationalization after the fact. Thus, any attempt to state affective objectives so as to permit evaluation of the extent to which they are real factors in behavior founders on the discrepancies among the actual affective qualities of a person, his statements about these, and his behavior (Lehmann, 1967, pp 41).

The particular instruments which have been employed to measure student valuing changes have been questioned by a number of people. For example, Martin (1971, pp 2-3) suggested that the Allport, Vernon, Lindzey Study of Values might not be sensitive and descriminating enough to be used with a college population. Feldman and Newcomb (1968, pp 8) point to the relative nature of the Allport, Vernon, Lindzey questionnaire as a potential limitation.

Allport, Vernon, Lindzey Study of Values

Robinson and Shaver (1973) offer two criticisms of the Allport, Vernon, Lindzey Study of Values. They first recognize the relativity of the questionnaire, in the sense that a high score on one scale necessitates a low score on another scale. A student's forced choice response may not be indicative of the way in which his/her values are actually held. "Another limitation is that the test is standardized on college students who are primarily in liberal arts. A systematic sampling of colleges has not been completed, and despite some studies of non-collegiate groups, there is still insufficient data to allow for generalization beyond this narrow range of subjects (Robinson and Shaver, 1973, pp 504-505)."

There have been other limitations cited of the Allport, Vernon, Lindzey questionnaire. As Robinson and Shaver have emphasized, the questionnaire was designed for liberal arts students. That raises the question as to whether the questionnaire is generalizable beyond the liberal arts student.

The type of data sought by the Allport, Vernon, Lindzey Study of Values appear vague. The questionnaire does not allow for an adequate distinction between data that indicate attitudes and data that indicate values. Robinson and Shaver (1973), for example, suggest that both attitudes and interests could be implied from the data collected from the Study of Values questionnaire.

Although it has been revised twice since 1931, the Allport, Vernon, Lindzey Study of Values is based on Spranger's Types of Men (1928), and the revisions have left the basic ingredients of the questionnaire untouched. One must beware of the possible unreliability of the questionnaire in terms of its adaptability to this generation of college students. Getzels (1972, pp 511) referred to a questionnaire he administered in the mid 1950's testing values of youth with similar caution. He concluded in the 1960's that he could not use the same questionnaire to gain reliable results because of the significant changes in youth characteristics over a decade of time. The Study of Values may suffer from similar limitations.

The Rokeach Value Survey

Many of the same limitations plague the Rokeach Value Survey. The Value Survey is also relativistic, forcing the student to choose among a predetermined list of terminal and instrumental values. "It is therefore impossible to know whether, for a given individual, the values are equally spaced along the importance continuum, or cluster together at a few points... (Robinson and Shaver, 1973, pp 548)."

An assumption of the Rokeach questionnaire reflects another potential limitation. Rokeach assumes that human beings hold relatively few values. This assumption allows him to formulate eighteen terminal and eighteen instrumental values which he claims are representative of the actual

number of values which exist. Rokeach also proposes that values are influenced by human experiences. To suggest that the thirty six values listed on the Value Survey are representative is to suggest that human experience is relatively uniform. The uniqueness of the individual and the relativity of the time may not adequately be reflected by the Value Survey.

General Limitations

Several writers have alleduded to a concern for the individual in measuring value changes. For example, Dukes (1955, pp 44) believed that the instrument measurement largely neglected the human factor. Lehmann (1967, pp 39-40) suggested that interview studies might be an important improvement in studying the value change of students. Interviewing techniques would begin to approach the concern of Coons (1970) that the student's personal history be considered an essential element in understanding the impact of colleges on student valuing. Instruments measure average change, but as Feldman and Newcomb suggest, instruments obscure "both the amount and direction of individual change (1968, pp 8-9)." Much of the past research on the impact of higher education on student valuing has been of groups of students and has largely ignored or obscured individual patterns of change (Huntley, 1967, pp 48).

Jacob's analysis of Changing Values in College provides an interesting case of data misuse. Jacob

often referred to data gathered from female students to apply to conclusions about male students, generalized from specific studies on particular student populations to all students and used one year studies to infer conclusions about higher education in general (Lehmann, 1965, pp 75). These criticisms reflect more on the use of data than on the limitations of the instrument.

One of the most significant limitations of past studies relates to inadequate definitions. How can values be measured if values are not clearly distinguished from other components of the belief system? Researchers also seem to be uncertain about the significance of studying the valuing patterns of students. Much of their uncertainty stems from an inadequate understanding of the role values play in human behavior and personality. What significance, then, can the study of the impact of college on student values have for improved learning?

The basic instruments used to study value changes of college students suffer from definitional problems.

> Development of a successful instrument for measuring values (which, in turn, is an integral part of the measurement of values and value change) is closely related to the problem of the definition of the concept of value.... To some researchers, <u>value</u>, <u>attitude</u>, <u>belief</u>, and <u>opinion</u> are used

> synonymously and interchangeably. To others, attitudes and values are considered as one category, while beliefs and opinions are considered as another (Lehmann, 1967, pp 35).

Instruments have been helpful in identifying the student's desired end-states of existence at a particular point in time, but expectations the student may have of college and the developmental process of valuing are not adequately reflected by instrument surveys.

Other limitations exist in the literature. One such limitation involves generalizing data from one institution to another. One cannot assume that because Newcomb (1943) found signifcant changes in values of the students at Bennington College that all American college students (even at that time) could be said to have changed in similar ways (Plant, 1958, pp 189-190).

Each institution reflects a number of internal variables in determining their impact on student valuing. Researchers have now begun to take seriously the complexity of institutional influences on student valuing, e.g. curriculum, faculty, and peers.

Research into the impact of college on student values has made significant contributions to improved learning, but many questions remain unanswered. Values must be more clearly defined and distinguished from such concepts as attitudes and beliefs. With an improved definitional

base, the significance of value research and improved research methods may follow. The complex nature of colleges and the totality of the student's environment are coming under closer scrutiny. Finally, research must begin to analyze why values change and not simply how they change.

Summary

This review of the literature on the impact of higher education on student values has focused on research from the time of Newcomb's Bennington College study (1943) to the present. Particular emphasis was placed on trends in the periods of Jacob, Feldman and Newcomb, and the time following the publication of Feldman and Newcomb's book The Impact of College on Students. Research methods and their limitations were reviewed. The conclusions might be summarized as follows:

(1) Instruments to measure student values have serious limitations. In depth interviews and behavior observations might be important aides in studying the valuing patterns of students and why the patterns change.

(2) Studying the impact of colleges on student valuing is an extremely complex undertaking. It is complex in relation to our understanding of the nature of values, the variety of institutional and societal influences on students, and gathering comprehensive and valid data on student valuing.

(3) A clearer definition of value and the relationship of the concept of value to other components of the belief system is essential.

Milton Rokeach (1972; 1973) has begun to develop a theoretical basis for research into the impact of college on student values. The more practical research into why student valuing patterns change and development of improved research methods remain as suggestions for future research.

Reference Notes

1. Flanagan, Dan. Research on Commuter Students from 1970-1975. Manuscript submitted for publication, 1975.

References

Allport, G. W., and Vernon, P. E. Study of Values: manual. Boston: Houghton and Mifflin, 1931.

Allport, G. W., Vernon, P. E., and Lindzey, G. Study of Values: manual (3rd ed.). Boston: Houghton and Mifflin, 1960.

Astin, Alexander W. College Impact on Student Attitudes and Behavior. Washington, D. C. : U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education (ED 047 633), 1971.

Axelrod, Joseph and Freedman, Mervin B. Search for Relevance: The Campus in Crisis. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969.

Barton, Allen H. Studying the Effects of College Education: A Methodological Examination of Changing Values in College. The Edward W. Hazen Foundation, 1959.

Bennett, Robert E. Student Values. Washington, D. C. : U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education (ED 041 350), 1970.

Chickering, Arthur W. Education and Identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1972.

Coons, Frederick W. The Resolution of Adolescence in College. Personnel and Guidance Journal, March 1970, 48, number 7.

Cross, K. Patricia. Student Values Revisited. Washington, D. C. : U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare (ED 025 205), 1968.

Dressel, Paul L. and Lehmann, Irvin J. The Impact of Higher Education on Student Attitudes, Values, and Critical Thinking Abilities. Educational Record, 1965, 46, 248-258.

Duffy, Elizabeth. A Critical Review of Investigations Employing the Allport-Vernon Study of Values and Other Texts of Evaluative Attitudes. Psychological Bulletin, 1940, 37, 597-617.

Dukes, William F. Psychological Studies of Values. Psychological Bulletin, 1955, 52.

Elton, Charles. Patterns of Change in Personality Test Scores. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1969, 16, number 2, 95-99.

Feldman, Kenneth A. and Newcomb, Theodore, M. The Impact of College on Students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968.

Getzels, J. W. On the Tranformation of Values: A Decade After Port Huron. School Review, August, 1972, 80, number 4.

Hunter, E. C. Changes in General Attitudes of Women Student During Four Years in College. The Journal of Social Psychology, 1942, 16, 243-257.

Huntley, C. W. Changes in Values During the Four Years of College. College Student Survey, 1967, 1, 43-48.

Jacob, Philip E. Changing Values in College: An Exploratory Study of the Impact of College Teaching. New York: Harper and Row, 1957.

Katz, Joseph, et. al. No Time for Youth: Growth and Constraint in College Students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968.

Lehmann, Irvin J. and Ikenberry, Stan K. Critical Thinking, Attitudes, and Values in Higher Education. Washington, D. C. : U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education (ED 002 856), 1959.

Lehmann, Irvin J. Changes in Critical Thinking, Attitudes, and Values from Freshman to Senior Years. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1963, 54, number 6, 305-315.

Lehmann, Irvin J. and Dressel, Paul L. Changes in Critical Thinking Ability, Attitudes, and Values Associated with College Attendance. Washington, D. C. : U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education (ED 003 296), 1963.

Lehmann, Irving J. American College Students and the Socialization Process. In W. B. Brookover (Ed.) The College Student. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1965, 58-77.

Lehmann, Irvin J., Sinha, Birendra K., and Hartnett, Rodney T. Changes in Attitudes and Values Associated with College Attendance. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1966, 57, number 2, 89-98.

Lehmann, Irvin J. Problems of Methodology in the Study of Values. College Student Survey, 1967, 1, 35-48.

Martin, William E. College Student Values: An Historical and Conceptual Perspective. Washington, D. C. : U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education (ED 073 379), 1971.

Newcomb, Theodore M. Personality and Social Change: Attitude Formation in a Student Community. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1943.

Parsons, Talcott and Platt, Gerald M. Age, Social Structure, and Socialization in Higher Education. Sociology of Education, 1970, 43, number 1, 1-37.

Parsons, Talcott and Platt, Gerald M. The American University. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Pearson, Barbara, and Levin, Jack. Some Determinants of Anti-Establishment Career Goals: An Empirical Analysis. Psychological Reports, 1971, 28, 849-850.

Perry, William G, Jr. Forms of Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1970.

Plant, Walter T. Changes in Ethnocentrism Associated with a Four-Year College Education. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1958, 49, number 3.

Robinson, John P. and Shaver, Philip R. Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1973.

Rokeach, Milton. Beliefs, Attitudes and Values: A Theory of Organization and Change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1972.

Rokeach, Milton. The Nature of Human Values. New York: The Free Press, 1973.

Sikula, John P., Sikula, Roberta R and Sikula, Andrew F. Value Changes in Black and White University Interns. Washington, D. C. : U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education (ED 089 167), 1974.

Spranger, E. Types of Men. Halle: Niemy, 1928.

Whitely, Paul L. The Constancy of Personal Values. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1938, 33, 405-408.

Footnotes

[1] Most researchers compare student data over two or four year periods. Significant differences are more likely to appear over time if the college experience does have an impact on student values.

[2] Spranger's types of men include the theoretical man, the economic man, the aesthetic man, the social man, the political man, and the religious man.